



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/614,769	07/12/2000	Shinji Hamada	P19757	2412

7055 7590 03/14/2002

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1941 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

MAPLES, JOHN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1745

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2002

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/614,769

Applicant(s)

HAMADA ET AL.

Examiner

John S. Maples

Art Unit

1745

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 ~~is~~ are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 and 11 ~~is~~ are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 ~~is~~ are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1745

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that there is no serious burden on the examiner to examine both groups and that the search for one group would overlap to cover the other group. Applicant also argues that the claims overlap in the same subject matter. This is not found persuasive because the search for one group is not the same for the other group. As stated in the 11/27/01 restriction requirement, Group I is classified in subclass 163 in class 429 while Group II is placed in subclass 156. Thus the two groups are found in different areas and searching both groups would require extra burden upon the examiner. Also, it may be true that there may be some overlapping subject matter in the two groups, however, the two groups are patentably distinct for the reasons given in the above noted restriction requirement.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. The sentence on page 15, lines 7-13 does not make sense grammatically.
3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent basis for "distal ends" found in line 6 of claim 6.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- yes! 5. Claims <sup>3-8, 12-14</sup> 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Edwards et al.-US 4,603,093. (Edwards)

IF There is no 810E → 810 1

Art Unit: 1745

See the Abstract of Edwards along with Figures 7-8 and 11-12. Reference is made to column 6, lines 4-52 for the disclosure of the claimed subject matter.

X 6. Claims 1-3, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirokou et al.-US 5,871,861. (Hirokou)

Reference is made to Figures 8 and 12 of the patent to Hirokou along with column 13, lines 19-33 and column 14, lines 22-56.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Dougherty et al.-US 4,029,855 (Dougherty).

The only claimed feature not taught by the lead acid battery in Edwards is the serpentine separator. The patent to Dougherty discloses in Figure 3 and in column 3, lines 3-61, a serpentine separator used in a lead acid battery. To utilize in the battery of

KEEP  
APPLICANT  
POINT  
ALERT

Art Unit: 1745

Edwards the separator of Dougherty would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made so that manufacturing costs could be reduced in making the lead acid battery by not requiring a cutting step for the separator.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Maples whose telephone number is 703-308-1795. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:15-3:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gabrielle Brouillette can be reached on 703-308-0756. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or preceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

John S. Maples  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1745

JSM/3-10-02